

of resign, and in their own church. Brave men, those pious Trinitarians! I wonder if they don't think the Democrats all infidels? A number of persons stand to me, that they had no doubt that these heathenish loaves had been set on by citizens and professors, to take this course to break up the meeting. Benedict Arnold must have fought for the liberty of these outrages of sacred rights. Are you not alarmed, ye pious drivelers, lest the morals of your children should be poisoned by the Garrisonians? Don't you think it treason to speak of a Union that has embedded in the blood, murdered spirits and murdered families of 3,000,000 of immortal souls? Won't you build synagogues—make long prayers for a pretence—and then train up your children in the way they should go, that they may sing in solemn mockery, alas, and did my *Savior* bleed, in your own sanctuary? Far be it from me to think that a majority of the citizens of Troy village would approve such conduct. If not, expose any and every man who encourages such acts, that the finger of scorn and contempt be not pointed at you by every decent man.

B. W. RICHMOND.

ANTI-WAR RESOLUTIONS.

The following are the resolutions adopted by the Anti-War meeting in Faneuil Hall on Thursday evening:

Whereas, the President of the United States, by the invasion of disputed territory in Mexico, has plunged this nation into an unnecessary war with that Republic; and whereas, the said President has, in his message to Congress, asserted that he is, in person in the United States, and that he is disposed to give aid and comfort to the enemy; and whereas, we deem it important that the sentiments of those opposed to this war should be known, and that the calmness contained in the assertion of the President, should be refuted.

Resolved, That we view the pending war with Mexico with deep sorrow and disgust, believing it to be a war of aggression on the part of the United States, originated by the Government for reprehensible purposes, and to be, in its prosecution, disastrous, criminal, and inhuman.

Resolved, That we deem the assertion, that but persons in the United States are opposed to the war, to be untrue and dishonouring to the people, to be the greater part of the citizens of these States, to be approvers of unjustifiable invasion of an injured neighboring Republic.

Resolved, That the proposition—that the only way to restore peace is to prosecute the war with vigor, until the Government of Mexico is compelled to sue for peace, is a proposition of principle, and erroneous in policy; that such an oppression of Mexico would be highly disgraceful to this country; and that it is the imperative duty of this Government to withdraw its troops from all the dominions of Mexico, and its vessels of war from her coast; and to offer her a reasonable peace, which shall redress her wrongs, and be honorable to both nations.

Resolved, That the doctrine—that however wrong may be the origin of this war, now that it is commenced, it is the duty of all good citizens to aid and abet the Government in its prosecution—is false and immoral; but that, on the contrary, it is incumbent on every true Christian and Patriot, to abstain from all voluntary aid or support to the war, and to give all moral, legal, and peaceful encouragement to it.

Resolved, That it is expedient that a petition or remonstrance, signed by all citizens of Boston who honour in these views, should be immediately forwarded to Congress, urging on its bodies the justice and policy of receding from our course in Mexico, and offering a reasonable and honorable peace.

Resolved, That we invite all other cities and towns in the United States, who colour in these views, to unite with us in the passage of similar memorials to Congress.

THE RANSOM OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

We have read with attention and interest the argument of the Liberator, in defence of the ransom of this distinguished man. Our opinions respecting the propriety of the deed are unchanged. From the first moment that we heard that money was to be paid to his pretended 'owner,' in order to secure his freedom, we have deeply regretted it, and do so still. We always consider it a cause of regret when slaveholders draw money from the pockets of abolitionists, in return for the freedom of their victims. If thereby one is emancipated, the price of another to fill the vacuum is paid. The master, who is the land of the kidnapper was upon Latimer, we disapproved of the purchase of his freedom. In the case of Frederick Douglass, we think that there are peculiar reasons for his inexperience. He was, indeed, an object of especial hatred and fear to slaveholders, but the cause which had operated to make him such, had also made him exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to recapture him on the soil of New-England. The fact, that such a man as he is, could stand up before America, England, and the world, and say, 'I am a slave, under the Constitution of the United States,' invested him with immense moral power, which he effectively wielded in the service of freedom. We well remember the time when he was pressed against the wall, and when he was told to purchase his freedom, and he nobly declared that he would rather die than be sold. We are glad that Frederick Douglass publicly declares that he had possessed one hundred and fifty pounds, he would have waited till the emergency came, and only given up the money when nothing else would do.—*Id.*

DOUGLASS.

We understand that some British friends have purchased Frederick Douglass of his former master for \$750, and made him a Christmas present of himself. Although this evinces much generosity, and we doubtless rejoice in the result, yet we fear it will be no benefit to the anti-slavery cause. An attempt never would have been made to force Douglass to toil again on a Southern plantation, and his safety from abduction and assassination has not been increased by this purchase. However much our sympathies lead us to rejoice that our dear friend is legally free, the using of funds for the redemption of any pure, white, and justifiable, the question is: Is this a case? We think not, and are glad that Frederick Douglass publicly declares that he had possessed one hundred and fifty pounds, he would have waited till the emergency came, and only given up the money when nothing else would do.—*Id.*

WASHINGTON, Feb. 6.

SENATE. Mr. Dix presented the preamble and resolutions from the Legislature of the State of New York, with regard to the existing war with Mexico, and in opposition to the establishment of slavery in newly acquired territories.

Mr. Bagley offered a resolution, declaring that the said resolutions transmitted from the Legislature of New York were in contravention of the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and opposed to those States wherein slavery already exists. [Rat.]

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE. The last number of the Eclectic Review, the venerable organ of the Evangelical party in England, contains a long, temperate, and exceedingly well written review of all the published statements regarding the Alliance anti-slavery, in which the course of that pious body on that point is condemned in the strongest manner. The writer of the review shows himself perfectly familiar with the subject, and although evidently a churchman, he bestows high praise upon Garrison, Geo. Thompson, and other prominent anti-slavery 'fanatics.'—*Penn. Freeman.*

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, FEBRUARY 12, 1847.

WILLIAM GOODELL AND WENDELL PHILLIPS.

In a recent number of the Liberator, we made a very slight allusion to the discussion between Mr. Goodell and Mr. Phillips, as to the pro-slavery character of the American Constitution, and ventured to hint to the former of these gentlemen, that he usually deals in too many words, amplifies too much, and wears by his prolixity a long column to an antagonist, in return for a short paragraph. This hint does not appear to have been kindly received as it was intended. On our first page is a rejoinder from Mr. Goodell, which indicates a highly disturbed state of mind on his part, as though we had impeached his moral integrity, instead of merely criticizing his style.

A review of Mr. Goodell's pamphlet on the American Constitution appeared in the Anti-Slavery Standard, a short time since, from the pen of Mr. Phillips. It was a terse, keen, argumentative refutation, and disposed of the mass of irrelevant matter and fallacious reasoning in the pamphlet, in a summary and conclusive manner. The pamphlet occupied one hundred and sixty pages. Mr. Phillips found that six columns and a half of the Standard amply sufficed to confute it. Instead of replying to him, through the medium of the same paper, and thus enabling its readers to see both sides of the controversy, Mr. Goodell published his rejoinder in the Albany Patriot, the readers of which journal had not seen a word of Mr. P.'s review. We expressed our surprise at this conduct, knowing as we did that he would be allowed—not as a favor, but as a matter of justice and right—to occupy at least as much space in the Standard as Mr. Phillips, and even more, if he desired it. Not very ingeniously he asks—'Would you have me visit upon the Standard the scourge of prolixity so much dreaded by yourself?' We answer, the proper place for his reply was the Standard, not the Patriot; and we would not have him, at any time, or for any purpose, visit upon either of those journals, a needless multiplication of words and quotations. We would urge him to be less diffuse—that's all. His insinuation, that the Standard would have been unwilling to give him fair play, is highly unjust. That it would have been willing to publish all he wished to write, we cannot say; for in all probability, that would have depended upon the bulk of his manuscript; but that he would have been permitted to exceed the room occupied by his reviewer, we are quite sure. More than this he had no right to expect or demand.

To shield himself from the charge of verbosity, Mr. Goodell says—'A sneer or a cavil, an affirmation or denial, which nothing short of successive chapters can displace or confute, may be comprised in a sentence. Dugmentation can afford to be brief—dugmentation chooses to be. Misrepresentations may be perpetrated in half a page, sufficient to occupy at least a column for a paragraph in the needful exposure.' All this is very true, but it does not prove that our friend is not apt to be rather wordy. Moreover, it is to beg the question, which, in the present case, we cannot allow. He assumes that the sneers, and cavils, and affirmations, and denials, and misrepresentations, and dogmatism, and domination, are all on the side of those who presume to dissent from his views; while on his part, all is courteous, modest, magnanimous, logical, straight forward, demonstrative! This is an easy mode of determining how much room the contending parties are entitled to occupy; but it savors of egotism, and must be ruled out of court, because the arbiter is an interested witness. As a general rule, we maintain that it is sophistry, not truth—wrong, not right—that requires a labyrinth of postulates and inferences.

Mr. Goodell alludes to our own 'intemperate' controversies with colonizationists, the book that we published to expose the real character of the Colonization Society, &c. But he is most unfortunate in his references. The book was chiefly a compilation from the sayings and doings of that Society and its adherents: our own comments were brief to a fault. It was fiercely assailed, and severely reviewed, though never answered; but we scarcely noticed any of the criticisms, because we knew the work was irrefutable. Where we wrote one column against the Colonization Society, its defenders wrote ten in its favor.

If there is an habitually gentle, amiable, magnanimous, fair-minded and unpretending man in the wide world, that man is Wendell Phillips. Whether in oral controversy, or as a reviewer with his pen, he is a model for disputants. He has many great and shining qualities; but the greatest is his rare simplicity of character, and utter crucifixion to all the blandishments, habits and aims of aristocratic life. In exposing the cause of the down-trodden and despised negro as his own, and throwing himself a living sacrifice upon the altar of humanity, he became a willing exile from the circles of affluence and refinement in which he might have moved without a rival, gave up all chance of political preferment when he might have successfully aspired to state and national elevation, and subjected himself to popular reproach as an 'ultraist' and 'fanatic,' at a time of life when it is the hardest to turn the back upon public esteem and social respectability. He has done for the anti-slavery enterprise, in disregard of family rank and sacrifice of worldly prospects, what it has been in the power of very few abolitionists to do; and he has done it, too, without boasting or show, without seeming to be aware that he has performed any thing specially meritorious; so true has been to his conviction of duty, so indifferent to what might be the popular verdict as to his course.

It is equally painful and pitiable to see how Mr. Goodell, in appreciating the greatness of the sacrifice thus made, makes the family relationship of Mr. Phillips the occasion of bitter personality and vulgar abuse. He tauntingly speaks of 'patrician efficiency,' of 'the tiny fingered, grown-up babies of a pampered aristocracy,' of 'a patrician sort,' of 'a pampered aristocracy,' &c. &c.; and this he does without provocation, and obviously to gratify a morbid 'democratic' jealousy, as well as for lack of sound argument. Throughout his voluminous rejoinder to Mr. Phillips, (some twenty-eight columns in reply to six and a half, to say nothing of his pamphlet of 160 pages) his personal irritation seems in almost every paragraph; and his chief effort seems to be, to say as many sarcastic and contemptuous things of Mr. Phillips as possible, because the latter has ventured to express the opinion, that Mr. Goodell's pamphlet on the Constitution is inconclusive and irrelevant. This is wholly unworthy of him. One whose skin is so thin, should be careful how he provokes assault. Especially should he be careful, while complaining of the want of courtesy and respect on the part of another, not to run to the verge of vulgar rudeness, to prove that he himself knows how to be gentlemanly.

How much I am personally indebted to Mr. Wendell Phillips! says Mr. Goodell, in the Albany Patriot, 'on the score of gentlemanly courtesy and good breeding, the readers of his articles will judge;' and in his letter on our first page, he rebukes Mr. P. for 'the ungentlemanly, the contemptuous, the sneering, the abusive, the arrogant style employed on this, and many other occasions.' And he says—'I claim to be treated as a man.' Of what, then, has Mr. Phillips really been guilty? He marvels at my 'astounding confessions of ignorance,' says Mr. Goodell. Very well—is that to be rude? He thinks my 'book does not admit of an answer,' and declares that 'one might as well answer an encyclopedia,' says Mr. Goodell. It is unwell in him to tell what he thinks? 'Of the hundreds who

have sounded its praises, not ten have read it through,' says Mr. Phillips. But this is only a strong mode of expressing his opinion of its general heaviness and obscurity, and not intended to be literally exact. 'He compares me to old Jer. Mason,' says Mr. Goodell, who, in a desperate case, as counsel for another, succeeded in confusing the jury by a needless and tedious examination of witnesses. 'The result proved his cunning; the despairing jury took refuge in a verdict of acquittal.' Finally, Mr. Phillips, alluding to Mr. G's pamphlet, quotes the maxim, 'de mortuis nil nisi bonum'—(never censure the dead.) Now this, according to Mr. Goodell's own showing, is the 'sum total' of the 'ungentlemanly, the contemptuous, the sneering, the abusive, the arrogant style' employed by Mr. Phillips, in his review! The outcry is truly ludicrous. It is a mole-hill magnified to a mountainous size. That Mr. Phillips had no wish or intention to do injustice to the talents of Mr. Goodell, is certain. 'Our criticism,' he says, 'does not spring from any disrespect to Mr. Goodell's logical ability: we are among those who appreciate it very highly.' The difficulty, then, lay in the absurdity and impossibility of Mr. G's task, not in himself. Was this to be discourtesy or personal? No, but discriminating and just. Not Gabriel himself can prove that two and two make five; but the task is just as sensible and easy, as for any man to cudgel his brains to prove the monstrous fiction, that, in the formation of the American Constitution, no slaveholding compromises were made, touching the foreign slave trade, a slave representation in Congress, the arrest of fugitive slaves, the suppression of servile insurrections, &c. No greater departure from the truth is possible, no stronger contempt for historical fact and judicial authority can be shown, than for any person to affirm, that, at the CONSTITUTION, slavery is, and was intended to be, EXLAWFUL OF THE AMERICAN SOIL, by those who framed and adopted that instrument. There is no more room for doubt or uncertainty on this point, than there is as to the violence of the nation itself. That Constitution is a 'covenant with death, and an agreement with hell,' and ought to be instantly annulled by all those who revere the supremacy of God, and believe in the brotherhood of the human race.

But Mr. Phillips writes in bad taste and temper, says Mr. Goodell. Let us see, then, how courteous and catholic, mild and persuasive, he is himself. We have not all his numbers before us, as published in the Albany Patriot; but we call the following, as illustrating his idea of good breeding and fair treatment, when he has to deal with an opponent.

Mr. Phillips is sneeringly represented by him as one of those 'who appear to regard the circle of fifty miles around Boston as constituting the whole literary and moral world, so far at least as America is concerned.'—'One of the par excellence and exclusive abolitionists of the Boston Old School, upon whom the taint of secession from holy mother church of Old Organization has never been found.'—'An ultra abolitionist, too deeply dyed in the wool to be contaminated by contact with those spurious abolitionists who vote against slavery.' He is scoffed at for 'his arrogant professional claim.' His characteristic modesty! His sublime tendency of a republican form of government! His little, hap-hazard, intermittent style of inquiry! His petulant process of snatching a glimpse at my book! 'His caricatures and his bug-a-boo style of the disorders and impracticabilities of a thorough republicanism.'—'A mere legal quibbler, a stickler for technicalities at the expense of the living spirit.'—'No Essex Juno to Federalist, in Timothy Pickens's times, ever satirized the idea of carrying out republican principles with a reader pen.'—'He can flippantly tell his readers.'—'Mr. Wendell Phillips appears as the exponent of the Constitution, and your Madisons and Jeffersons must retire into the background.'—'Wendell Phillips is a regularly educated lawyer, and knows all about it!'

Our luminous Constitutional expositor!—'Our Massachusetts Solon!'

—'This Mr. Phillips himself will not muster assurance enough to deny.'—'How little of respect, either for himself or those on whom he expects to exert an influence, can such a writer retain!'

—'Hubs, Chubb and Tindall never went beyond this.'—'Such cool impudence as this!'

—'Such artifices as these!'

—'I cannot recollect an instance of cool and deliberate effrontery exceeding this!'

—'Mr. Wendell Phillips stoops down with all the conscious dignity and dejection of a patrician!'

—'If the patrician efficiency, or snuff, or Gallic-like indifference to the subject, prevented my supercilious reviewer!'

—'One of the tiny-fingered, grown-up babies of a pampered aristocracy, claiming the monopoly of all wisdom!'

—'Heartless loons, whose athletic education, &c.'—'In hunting small game, one is compelled to make use of small shot!'

—'The gangrene of anti-republicanism and patrician scorn is sufficiently visible to the eye here!'

—'Query, whether bitred of slavery or republicanism preponderates in this assumption!'

—'Alas for the McDuffies and Calhouns of the South! the Phillipses and Quincy of the North!'

—'Peradventure, it might knock Boston non-government into the air!'

—'You [Mr. Phillips] may wriggle and twist as much as you please!'

—'Your professional tactics, rich as you are in them, will all fail you here!'

—'Ye Boston monopolists of Constitutional law knowledge!'

—'Ye exclusive moral reformers and casuists!'

—'Sages ye are, doubtless, and wisdom shall die with you!'

—'No man, not warped by his prejudices into a state of semi-insanity, will ever believe that the meaning given by Mr. Phillips to the Constitution is the true meaning!'

—'All this, by that profound lawyer, illustrious philanthropist, and redoubtable moral reformer and peace advocate, Wendell Phillips, Esq. of Boston, second lieutenant (or aspirant to be) of the world-famous William Lloyd Garrison!'

Surely, he who can pour out so copious a stream of misrepresentation, satire and spleen, in the last one who should arraign the courtesy and fairness of another.

Mr. Goodell denies that he seceded from the old organization platform, because women as well as men were allowed to occupy it, and plead for the slave. Why then did he leave us? Of what had we been guilty, that he would no longer give us his companionship or countenance? How came he to drop his membership, precisely when the secession took place—and why has he ever since declined participating in our meetings? Has he not been giving aid and comfort to the most venomous opponents of the American Anti-Slavery Society—to such men as Alvan Stewart and Joshua Leavitt? What was the sole issue raised at the annual meeting, in 1840, by the seceding faction? It was whether a woman (Abby Kelley) should be put upon one of the committees! The Society voted that the rights of its members were equal, irrespective of sex, and confirmed the nomination of that philanthropic woman. For doing this, nothing but this, the Society was rent asunder, and the minority seceded in the spirit of mortal enmity, and organized the 'American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,' with the avowed purpose of crushing the old Parent Society! Mr. Goodell says he was not present at that meeting. We know it—he was skulking, as did some others. He says he took no part in the controversy. Why did he sit on the fence? He saw the Parent Society violently dismembered, and a hostile society formed; but he said nothing! Neither party deserved censure or praise! He says it was 'a foolish quarrel.' On whose part? Did the Parent Society do wrong in refusing to gag one half of its members? He says he regarded this as a quarrel 'between the abolitionists of the two rival Atlantic cities!'

This is preposterous; it had as much to do with the remote hamlet as with the nearest city. It was not a question of geographical position, but of personal right; and in the prodigal transfer of the Emancipator, and the unjustifiable seizure of the Depository, it involved the question of moral honesty and executive trustworthiness. We have yet to read the first sentence, penned by Mr. Goodell, in derogation of the 'American and Foreign A. S. Society,' or its organ. We have seen much from his pen, in bitter disparagement of the American A. S. Society and the Standard. And this he calls neutrality!

He says he protested against the course of the chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Society, (Mr. Gibbons,) and of the assistant editor of the Standard, (Mr. Child,) in advocating the election of Henry Clay, at the last Presidential campaign. So did we—so did the editor of the Standard, (Mrs. Child)—so did the American Society, and its auxiliaries; facts which he omits to state. As to the duty of abolitionists, in regard to pro-slavery churches, the doctrine of the Society has been 'ultra' as Mr. Goodell himself.

He is at a loss to know, how he can discharge his political obligations without voting. He might as well object, that a man cannot discharge his religious duties, without being connected with a church. Not to vote is frequently the most effective mode of political action; and this was recommended in behalf of the old seceding Executive Committee, by Messrs. J. G. Birney, H. B. Stanton, and Edgar Wright, Jr., in 1839, rather than to vote for a pro-slavery Whig or Democrat. Besides, the recognition, by the Declaration of Sentiments, of the duty of political action, as presented in the Constitution of the United States, was no pledge, on our part, to do every thing that the Constitution might allow, but only to conform, in all that we should do, to the provisions of that instrument. The phrase was inserted mainly to guard against the then prevalent outcry, that our measures were designed to trample on the laws, and with special reference to slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories.

Further—even if it meant more, has not enough occurred since, to release any man from old pledges; and not only to justify, but demand of him to assume a revolutionary ground? Have not many of the States, all our wisest statesmen, and the honest portion of all parties, again and again confessed, that, within the last thirteen years, the Constitution has been continually overturned and trampled under foot; in the words of J. Q. Adams, become the 'shadow of a great name'?

More than thirteen years have elapsed since that Declaration was written. The action of the American Anti-Slavery Society has ever been strictly in accordance with it. We see no occasion to alter a sentence or syllable in it. All this it says, all that it means, we as readily endorse to-day, as we did when we penned it. But can William Goodell, one of its signers, say as much? He seems disposed to make it the test of anti-slavery belief and action, by quoting it against us, as heeroneously thinks. By his own standard, then, let him be tried. Now, though the anti-slavery cause has materially changed its aspect and tactics, since 1833, the American Constitution has undergone no alteration. What, then, is said in the Declaration of Sentiments in regard to the Constitution?

'We fully and unanimously recognize the sovereignty of each State, to legislate exclusively on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated within its limits. We concede that Congress, under the present national compact, has no right to interfere with any of the slave States, in relation to this momentous subject.'

Does Mr. Goodell adhere to this opinion now? No—he professes to hold slavery, wherever it may be found on the American soil, to be utterly UNCONSTITUTIONAL! Consequently, that either Congress or the Supreme Court of the United States, or both, have a right to declare the immediate freedom of every slave in the land, and to enforce that declaration at all hazards! Quite a change, certainly.

Again—the 'Declaration' asserts that 'The people of the free States are now living under a pledge of their tremendous physical force to fasten the yoke of slavery upon the limbs of millions in the Southern States—they are indubitably called, at any moment, to suppress a general insurrection of the slaves—they authorize the slave owner to vote for three-fifths of his slaves as property, and thus enable him to perpetuate his oppression—they support a standing army at the South for its protection—and they seize the slave who has escaped into their territories, and send him back to be tortured by an enraged master or a brutal driver. This relation to slavery is criminal, and full of danger: IT MUST BE BROKEN UP.'

Mr. Goodell no longer believes a word of all this! He now denies that the American Constitution contains, or was ever designed to contain, any pro-slavery guarantees! It is thoroughly anti-slavery! And whoever dissents from this doctrine 'is not an avowed, one of the Federal Junta, a hater of republicanism, an ignoramus, or something quite as foolish or abhorrent!'

One other point, and we have done. Mr. Goodell seems to be astounded at the intelligence, that 'no believer in the inherent criminality of slaveholding is excluded from the American Anti-Slavery Society, whatever his religious or political faith, or whether he receives or rejects the doctrine of disunion.' With hands and eyes uplifted in amazement he earnestly inquires—'Do you welcome members of the pro-slavery Methodist Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church, &c. to your Society, as good members? And are members of the pro-slavery political parties welcomed as faithful members of your Society?' Answer—the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society is precisely the same now, as it was when William Goodell voted for its adoption in Philadelphia, with all whose names are appended to the Declaration of Sentiments. Was it too catholic then? Ought it to be more proscriptive now? We think not. All who can subscribe to the doctrine, that slaveholding is under all circumstances a sin against God, and that immediate emancipation is the duty of the master and the right of the slave, are welcomed to its membership. The Society never has had the power to cut off, or exclude any of its members, however inconsistent with their anti-slavery profession may be their connection with a pro-slavery church or a pro-slavery party. Perfect unanimity of opinion among them, as to the measures to be adopted, it does not expect or enforce. Its platform, therefore, is neither so narrow as to be uncharitable, nor so broad as to be indiscriminate. It is just what it should be. It leaves the conscience and intelligence of every member free to decide what shall be his relation to the Church and the State, on the subject of slavery. Yet as a Society, it cherishes and avows opinions, religiously and politically. It is to be judged by what it propagates or performs, not by the conduct of individual members. The flag of 'No Union with Slaveholders,' is the flag of the Society—not of every member of it—though a very gratifying unanimity prevails, at present, on that subject, both in the Society and among its kindred branches.

It is deserving of notice, that the most inconsistent charges are frequently brought, almost in the same breath, against the Society—such as, that it is inquisitorial, dogmatic, and intolerant; and then, that it is not sufficiently exclusive, is too lax, and ought to exercise a rigid discipline over its members! Now it is a non-voting, non-government Society, and impracticable because it discards political action; anon, it is charged with being a political body, as much so as the Liberty party, for its goal for a dissolution of the Union, and this involves the whole question of politics! Well—let its opponents rave, and caricature it as they may, the Society is still the embodiment of the most clear-sighted and uncompromising friends of the slave to be found in the land or the world.

This was italicized in the original, to indicate emphatically the sense of the signers on that point.

THE LIBERATOR.

patior, and the unjustifiable seizure of the Depository, it involved the question of moral honesty and executive trustworthiness. We have yet to read the first sentence, penned by Mr. Goodell, in derogation of the 'American and Foreign A. S. Society,' or its organ. We have seen much from his pen, in bitter disparagement of the American A. S. Society and the Standard. And this he calls neutrality!

He says he protested against the course of the chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Society, (Mr. Gibbons,) and of the assistant editor of the Standard, (Mr. Child,) in advocating the election of Henry Clay, at the last Presidential campaign. So did we—so did the editor of the Standard, (Mrs. Child)—so did the American Society, and its auxiliaries; facts which he omits to state. As to the duty of abolitionists, in regard to pro-slavery churches, the doctrine of the Society has been 'ultra' as Mr. Goodell himself.

He is at a loss to know, how he can discharge his political obligations without voting. He might as well object, that a man cannot discharge his religious duties, without being connected with a church. Not to vote is frequently the most effective mode of political action; and this was recommended in behalf of the old seceding Executive Committee, by Messrs. J. G. Birney, H. B. Stanton, and Edgar Wright, Jr., in 1839, rather than to vote for a pro-slavery Whig or Democrat. Besides, the recognition, by the Declaration of Sentiments, of the duty of political action, as presented in the Constitution of the United States, was no pledge, on our part, to do every thing that the Constitution might allow, but only to conform, in all that we should do, to the provisions of that instrument. The phrase was inserted mainly to guard against the then prevalent outcry, that our measures were designed to trample on the laws, and with special reference to slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories.

Further—even if it meant more, has not enough occurred since, to release any man from old pledges; and not only to justify, but demand of him to assume a revolutionary ground? Have not many of the States, all our wisest statesmen, and the honest portion of all parties, again and again confessed, that, within the last thirteen years, the Constitution has been continually overturned and trampled under foot; in the words of J. Q. Adams, become the 'shadow of a great name'?

More than thirteen years have elapsed since that Declaration was written. The action of the American Anti-Slavery Society has ever been strictly in accordance with it. We see no occasion to alter a sentence or syllable in it. All this it says, all that it means, we as readily endorse to-day, as we did when we penned it. But can William Goodell, one of its signers, say as much? He seems disposed to make it the test of anti-slavery belief and action, by quoting it against us, as heeroneously thinks. By his own standard, then, let him be tried. Now, though the anti-slavery cause has materially changed its aspect and tactics, since 1833, the American Constitution has undergone no alteration. What, then, is said in the Declaration of Sentiments in regard to the Constitution?

'We fully and unanimously recognize the sovereignty of each State, to legislate exclusively on the subject of the slavery which is tolerated within its limits. We concede that Congress, under the present national compact, has no right to interfere with any of the slave States, in relation to this momentous subject.'

Does Mr. Goodell adhere to this opinion now? No—he professes to hold slavery, wherever it may be found on the American soil, to be utterly UNCONSTITUTIONAL! Consequently, that either Congress or the Supreme Court of the United States, or both, have a right to declare the immediate freedom of every slave in the land, and to enforce that declaration at all hazards! Quite a change, certainly.

Again—the 'Declaration' asserts that 'The people of the free States are now living under a pledge of their tremendous physical force to fasten the yoke of slavery upon the limbs of millions in the Southern States—they are indubitably called, at any moment, to suppress a general insurrection of the slaves—they authorize the slave owner to vote for three-fifths of his slaves as property, and thus enable him to perpetuate his oppression—they support a standing army at the South for its protection—and they seize the slave who has escaped into their territories, and send him back to be tortured by an enraged master or a brutal driver. This relation to slavery is criminal, and full of danger: IT MUST BE BROKEN UP.'

Mr. Goodell no longer believes a word of all this! He now denies that the American Constitution contains, or was ever designed to contain, any pro-slavery guarantees! It is thoroughly anti-slavery! And whoever dissents from this doctrine 'is not an avowed, one of the Federal Junta, a hater of republicanism, an ignoramus, or something quite as foolish or abhorrent!'

One other point, and we have done. Mr. Goodell seems to be astounded at the intelligence, that 'no believer in the inherent criminality of slaveholding is excluded from the American Anti-Slavery Society, whatever his religious or political faith, or whether he receives or rejects the doctrine of disunion.' With hands and eyes uplifted in amazement he earnestly inquires—'Do you welcome members of the pro-slavery Methodist Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church, &c. to your Society, as good members? And are members of the pro-slavery political parties welcomed as faithful members of your Society?' Answer—the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society is precisely the same now, as it was when William Goodell voted for its adoption in Philadelphia, with all whose names are appended to the Declaration of Sentiments. Was it too catholic then? Ought it to be more proscriptive now? We think not. All who can subscribe to the doctrine, that slaveholding is under all circumstances a sin against God, and that immediate emancipation is the duty of the master and the right of the slave, are welcomed to its membership. The Society never has had the power to cut off, or exclude any of its members, however inconsistent with their anti-slavery profession may be their connection with a pro-slavery church or a pro-slavery party. Perfect unanimity of opinion among them, as to the measures to be adopted, it does not expect or enforce. Its platform, therefore, is neither so narrow as to be uncharitable, nor so broad as to be indiscriminate. It is just what it should be. It leaves the conscience and intelligence of every member free to decide what shall be his relation to the Church and the State, on the subject of slavery. Yet as a Society, it cherishes and avows opinions, religiously and politically. It is to be judged by what it propagates or performs, not by the conduct of individual members. The flag of 'No Union with Slaveholders,' is the flag of the Society—not of every member of it—though a very gratifying unanimity prevails, at present, on that subject, both in the Society and among its kindred branches.

It is deserving of notice, that the most inconsistent charges are frequently brought, almost in the same breath, against the Society—such as, that it is inquisitorial, dogmatic, and intolerant; and then, that it is not sufficiently exclusive, is too lax, and ought to exercise a rigid discipline over its members! Now it is a non-voting, non-government Society, and impracticable because it discards political action; anon, it is charged with being a political body, as much so as the Liberty party, for its goal for a dissolution of the Union, and this involves the whole question of politics! Well—let its opponents rave, and caricature it as they may, the Society is still the embodiment of the most clear-sighted and uncompromising friends of the slave to be found in the land or the world.

This was italicized in the original, to indicate emphatically the sense of the signers on that point.

THE Famine in Ireland. We have grouped together, on our last page, some of the particulars of the appalling state of things among the famished, sick, perishing population of Ireland. So great a national calamity, in regard to the means of subsistence, is probably not to be found in the history of the world. It is heart-rending to read the description of it—what must it be to endure? By all the claims of human brotherhood, and by all the simultaneous efforts that should be made, throughout this country, to procure and send to Ireland, without delay, all the supplies that can be spared. Every city, town, village, ought to hold a public meeting, and vote assistance; every free man, woman, and child ought to contribute something. Boston can easily send relief to the amount of one hundred thousand dollars, if our wealthy citizens will but lead the way. Will not the city authorities summon a public meeting in Faneuil Hall, to test the generous and sympathizing feelings of Bostonians? We are sure the call will be nobly responded to.

Abolitionists are generally far from being affluent, and they have a heavy load to carry, in order to give success to their great but unpopular cause; but, poor as they may be, they can do something for famine-stricken Ireland, especially as Irish hearts have again and again been opened to give them a helping hand. We are requested to state, that any donations they may be disposed to entrust with FRANCIS JACKSON, Esq. of this city, will be promptly applied to this beneficent purpose. Let us all spare at least our mite.

We learn from the Transcript, that a large and respectable meeting, for the relief of the poor in Ireland, was held Sunday evening in the basement of the Church of the Holy Cross. Bishop Fitzpatrick was appointed Chairman and Andrew Carney Treasurer. Over three thousand dollars were subscribed. Mr. Carney gave \$1000, Patrick Moony \$500, John J. Mahoney \$100. The other subscriptions varied from \$1 to \$500.

THE WAR. We cannot find room, in our present number, for the anti-war resolutions adopted at the late Liberty party Convention in Faneuil Hall, and transmitted to us for insertion by our friend S. E. Sewall; but we will reserve a place for them next week. Such resolutions we like; but they express sentiments directly opposed to those which have been advanced by various Liberty party journals, and demonstrate that the party, in a national sense, is divided against itself, and has no fixed principle as to the present atrocious war with Mexico.

NOT TRUE. The Liberator, Mr. Garrison's paper, introduces an article, from the 'Democratic Standard and Whig of 76,' a Liberty campaign paper published during the last election, in the following style:

'The following is from a paper, which was published in Cincinnati last summer, during the State political campaign, by the State Central Committee of the Liberty party. It was written by a member of the Committee, and published under the editorial hand,

TREASURER'S REPORT

Of Money received into the Treasury of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, from Jan. 1 to Feb. 1, 1847.

From N. Simmons, New-York,	\$ 1 00
" S. May, Leicester, 2; Wm. B. Earle,	3 00
do 1,	do 1,
Received of L. Moody, for collections by him,	
From A. L. Brooks, of Lowell, to redeem	
pledge,	10 00
" Asa Brett, Stoughton, do. do.	3 00
" Varanus Westworth, Stoughton, do. do.	2 00
" Duffield, Fall River, do. do.	15 00
" Old Colony A. S. S. H. Brigham,	5 00
Collections at S. S. Foster's lectures,	32 74
Received of A. Davis, for collections by him,	
From L. P. White, Norton,	1 00
" Collections at Abington lecture,	4 50
do at E. Randolph, do.	1 00
Received of Parker Pillsbury, for collections	
by him,	
From Lecture at Quincy,	2 50
" do. at Worcester,	1 00
" do. at Chelsea,	3 69
" do. at East Stoughton,	1 37
" do. at Northampton,	1 50
" do. at Foxboro',	1 25
" do. at Leominster,	2 00
" do. at West Cambridge,	2 00
Received from Finance Committee, for col-	
lections at Annual Meeting, as follows:	
Mary Plummer, 1 00 Mrs. J. M. Rollins, 5 00	
Adeline J. Fuller, 50 David White, 5 00	
John Coaking, 50 E. D. Draper, 1 00	
James E. Dow, 2 00 Abner Belcher, 1 00	
Mr. Jenkins, 50 G. Booth, 1 00	
Thatcher Hinkley, 50 Friends, 1 50	
A. Harvey, 50 Ansel H. Harlow, 5 00	
Geo. Howe, 25 Miss Ous, 1 50	
A. Southwick, 1 00 Miss Benson, 1 00	
Cash of sundry persons without names, 1 80 H. P. Hutton, 1 00	
James Jackson, 1 50 Joshua Cowdise, 2 00	
Wm. Farwell, 50 S. J. Wilkinson, 25 00	
Seth Sprague, 10 00 Margaret Harlow, 1 00	
Seth Sprague, 10 00 Susan C. Cabot, 1 00	
A Friend, 20 00 L. M. Giddings, 1 00	
B. Spooner, 10 00 L. H. Bowker, 5 00	
Eldridge Sprague, 10 00 M. G. Chapman, 1 00	
Jacob Leonard, 50 H. I. Draper, 6 00	
Geo. Howe, 50 H. I. Bowditch, 5 00	
Simson Dodge, 10 00 Seth Sprague, 1 00	
A Friend, 1 00 Samuel Reed, 1 00	
S. L. Bumpus, 50 Samuel Barrett, 1 00	
Lemuel Morton, 20 Joshua Ward, 1 00	
A Friend, 20 Seward Mitchell, 50	
H. Humphrey, 50 Asa Brett, 25	
Stillman Lathrop, 5 00 Eldridge Sprague, 1 00	
Reuben Harris, 10 00 Wm. Farwell, 1 00	
J. B. Harris, 2 00 Josiah Hayward, 1 00	
James E. Dow, 50 John Jackson, 1 00	
Elijah Estes, 1 00 Warren Law, 1 00	
Warren Carthill, 1 00 John Rogers, 5 00	
Richard Clapp, 1 00 Nathaniel Harlow, 1 00	
Sarah Clay, 1 00 H. I. Bowditch, 5 00	
John Rogers, 1 00 E. C. Chandler, 1 00	
E. A. Cotton, 30 Lemuel Morton, 1 00	
A Friend, 1 00 O. F. Harris, 50	
James Jackson, 1 00 S. Philbrick, 1 00	
Luther Melendy, 1 00 John Rand, 1 00	
Hopkiss P. A. S., 10 00 Lemuel Phillips, 1 00	
S. by Mrs. Bowker, 12 00 Wm. Jenkins, 1 00	
Richard Clapp, Jr., 1 00 E. H. Payson, 1 00	
Wm. Sears, 25 Francis Jackson, 3 00	
Mrs. B. Spooner, 1 00 Chas. F. Hovey, 1 00	
Sarah J. Remond, 1 00 E. C. Chandler, 1 00	
Rachel Smith, 25 Samuel May, 1 00	
D. Gregg, 1 00 Wm. Ashby, 1 00	
A Friend, 25 E. Thompson, 5 00	
H. G. Smith, 25 David Tilden, 5 00	
Wm. Bliss, 1 00 Lewis Ford, 2 00	
My. J. Buchanan, 50 — Beltingham, 2 00	
A Friend, 25 Edmund Jackson, 1 00	
Ansel H. Harlow, 1 00 Luther Melendy, 1 00	
Sundry friends, 2 75 R. B. Crosby, 5 00	
Mary Willie, 50 G. E. Jocelyn, 5 00	
Virge Brown, 1 00 M. Booth, 2 00	
A. K. Foster, 25 E. Quincy, 1 00	
Sarah Clay, 25 A. Wilson, 1 00	
Wm. Ashby, 10 00 Ira Gray, 1 00	
Stillman Lathrop, 1 00	

S. PHILBRICK,
Treasurer Mass. A. S. Society.

ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

A FAIR, in aid of the funds of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, will be held in New Bedford commencing on **THURSDAY EVENING, Feb. 11th,** and continuing through the week. The articles remaining unsold at the recent Fair in Boston will be *all taken to New Bedford*; and those received from Paris, too late for that occasion, will be offered for sale there. No efforts will be spared to render this occasion interesting and profitable.

Addresses are expected from eloquent friends of the Slave.

CAROLINE WESTON.

PAWTUCKET ANNUAL FAIR.

The Anti-slavery women of Pawtucket will hold their **Eleventh Annual Fair** at the hall of Pawtucket Hotel, commencing on **Wednesday, Feb. 27,** at 10 o'clock, P. M.

The usual supply of fancy and useful articles, together with refreshments of all kinds, will be furnished in abundance; and it is hoped that a generous public, as heretofore, will continue to aid the patriotic efforts of a few benevolent women, who are laboring for the overthrow of chattel slavery.

ESSEX COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

The next meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the new Hall at Danvers, New Mills, commencing at 10 o'clock, on **Saturday, 13th February,** and continuing through the next day (Sunday). It is hoped that the friends throughout the county will come to the meeting in *masses*. Questions of the greatest importance will come up for consideration. We have the assurance of the attendance of Stephen and Abby K. Foster, Charles L. Remond, Parker Pillsbury, Louis Moody, and many others, who are known as able advocates of our oppressed countrymen. The Mexican war, the abolition of this pro-slavery Union, and the character of the American Church will be prominent topics for discussion.

Per order of the Board of Managers.

RUTH BUFFUM,
Secretary.

BRISTOL COUNTY.

The quarterly meeting of the Bristol County Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the Town Hall, Fall River, on **Saturday, February 27,** and will probably continue through the next day. Efforts will be made to secure the attendance of Stephen and Abby K. Foster, Parker Pillsbury, and other speakers. The friends of the cause are earnestly requested to assemble in full force, and secure an interesting meeting.

W. P. ATKINSON, *Cor. Sec.*

NOTICE.

Charles Spear will lecture on the Treatment of Criminals in the United States in Littleton, on **Sunday next,** and in the **Unitarian church in Scituate,** on **Sabbath afternoon** after next, on the **Reformation of the Criminal,** and in the evening **Capital Punishment** at half past 6, in the same place. Also in the **Unitarian church in Watertown** on **Discharged Convicts,** on the **afternoon of the 4th Sabbath in February.**

**HITCHCOCK & HOLT,
DENTISTS,**
Corner of Court and Stoddard-streets, Boston.

DR. HITCHCOCK has resumed his professional duties at his Old Establishment, where he may always be found, and is now associated with Dr. Holt, who is as favorably known as an excellent operator. During the absence of Dr. H. he has visited the dentists in Europe, and has acquired all the improvements which are so successfully practised by them. In addition to his tour to Europe, and the extensive practice which he has been in the habit of pursuing, he is stating that, with the aid of his associate, his dental establishment is not to be surpassed by any in Europe or America, thereby rendering it an object to all wishing the services of a Dentist, to visit their office.

Dr. Holt is the skillful Dr. Hitchcock is too well known to need any commendation. No dentist has more extensive patronage in the city, and he would doubtless continue to deserve it—*Ed. Lib.*

**ROBERT MORRIS, Jr.,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BRAZER'S BUILDING, STATE ST.,
BOSTON**

